



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

and one from Smith's Baeda. All the rest are taken from Grein, and some of those given by Grein are omitted. *reodian* is given with the example from the Elene 1239, after Grein, but with no meaning, only (?). Grein says "*cribrare?*" and Zupitza "*nach Grein, sieben,*" so the student should have had at least this much help to the meaning. Some words just here have been examined, as *reódan*, *redfan*, *reónig*, *reónig-móð*, *reord-berend*, with the result that the only citations are those from Grein. The form *reóni*, given by Zupitza, is not noted, and *reónig-móð*, Elene 320, is wanting in Grein and here. The inference from this is that Prof. Toller has not made use of the glossaries to separate pieces of A. S. poetry, as that to Zupitza's Elene, for example, and has relied upon Grein for the poetic vocabulary. Grein's citations, while very full, and full enough for all ordinary purposes, are not complete; but, except in the case of very common words, it would be well for a later lexicographer to make use of all available helps to secure completeness in citations of examples. Perhaps omissions of words will be found by those who search for them, but it is probable that they will be few. Prof. Toller seems to have taken great pains to secure accuracy in the prose vocabulary, and is to be congratulated on the result. I hope that Part IV is so far advanced that we shall not have to wait another five years for it. An appendix will doubtless be needed, but that can be prepared more at leisure.

JAMES M. GARNETT.

Epicurea. Edidit HERMANNUS USENER. Leipzig, Teubner, 1887.

With winning frankness Professor Usener tells us in the preface to his *Epicurea* that he was attracted to Epicurus, not by his admiration of the Philosophy of the Garden, but by the difficulty and obscurity of our great source of information on the subject, Diogenes Laertius. He cared more for the philological nuts to be cracked than for the philosophical fruits to be gathered. However, the discovery that much help was to be gained from a study of the MSS led from one thing to another. If a part is to be mastered, the whole must be understood, and the result is a most important contribution to the documentary history of Greek philosophy, and not only so, but a study full of interest and instruction even to those *homines grammatici* who usually have little pleasure in Epicurus and things Epicurean.

After an account of the codices and the principal critical editions of Diogenes L., and after supplementing his own work by a number of emendations, Usener takes up the question of the attitude of D. L. towards Epicurus, and denies that he was either Epicurean or Empiric. A man who knew no Epicurean later than the time of Zeno could not have been an Epicurean. A man who did not know Sarapion or Glaukias could not have been a physician of the Empiric sect.

As for the sources of D., Usener agrees with Wilamowitz in thinking that it is high time to put an end to investigations about your 'tenth transmitters' of other people's learning, about Demetrius, Diocles, Favorinus. Why, those who have called Diogenes a miserable compiler or an unqualified ass have done him too much honor. D. did not rise even to the dignity of being a copyist; he merely hired other people to copy for him, and on the strength of this literary activity took to himself the glory of authorship. In those days a man bought books as one buys wines, and decanted them as one decants wines, not

without mixing vintages and blending manufactures. It was a common trick of the times to take what we should call text-books or manuals, add, cut out, change, and then publish them again under new titles as new books. Galen complains of it as Tertullian complains of it, and how justifiable these complaints were is shown by specimens of this doctoring process taken from the Laertian life of Plato, and from that part of book X which forms the setting of the Third Moral Epistle of Epicurus. In the latter case our friend, whom we will continue to call Laertius, sent to the shop a lot of 'copy,' consisting of a number of 'books' on the history of philosophy. This work belonged to a much earlier period, say to the time of Nero or the Flavii, and was addressed to some Neronian blue-stocking like Pamphila or to some of the *concumbentes Graece* of Juvenal. Together with this work were sent four compositions by Epicurus himself, and also a scholarly epitome of the Duties of the Sage according to Epicurus. The wild medley that ensued is what we have in our texts. But let us forgive Diogenes for the sake of the precious letters of Epicurus, without which we should be debarred from access to the esoteric discipline of the school. Unfortunately the terminology employed itself needs a key, and Professor Usener declines the task of interpreting the language of the epistles and contents himself with indicating the sources and the methods. As to the genuineness of the letters, the first, the Epistle to Herodotus, is above suspicion. The second, the Epistle to Pythocles, was not written by Epicurus himself, but made up by an Epicurean from the master's work *περί φύσεως*. The only passage that may have been taken as it stands from Epicurus is the prooemium, but all of it goes back to the master, always, of course, with the reservation that Epicurus himself drew largely on his predecessors for his explanations of physical phenomena. The third letter, the Epistle to Menoeceus, is written with great care. We are called on to note the equable cadence of the periods, the dainty pointedness of the language, and the almost Isocratean avoidance of hiatus—a mechanical excellence, by the way, which we find in some of the poorest writers. This elegance of style—which Epicurus notoriously not only neglected but despised—might at first make us suspicious of the genuineness of this production, but the fact is that by far the most of Epicurus' works belonged to the class of *ὑπομνήματα* of which no style was expected, and that he has been judged by these rather than by those fragments in which we can trace the same elegance of style that characterizes the third epistle. But the genuineness is put beyond a doubt by the testimony not only of Clemens Alex. and Laertius, but of Seneca, Sextus Emp., Lactantius, and Ambrosius, the last named of whom actually translates one passage and summarizes another.

The last Epicurean contribution is the *libellus vere aureus* *Κύρια δόγματα*, Cicero's *ratae sententiae* (de fin. II 7, 20), which Usener prefers to call *selectae sententiae* on the strength of another passage of Cicero (de nat. deor. I 30, 85) and by reason of the appropriateness of the designation. This selection, however, was no more made by Epicurus himself than the aphorisms of Hippocrates were put together by Hippocrates, or the problems of Aristotle by Aristotle. The choice, after we pass the first four (*ἡ τετραφάρμακος*), does not seem to have been wisely directed. Leading doctrines have been omitted, secondary ones introduced. And then there are traces of the rude severance of sentences from their context, there

are inconsequences of arrangement, there are doublets upon doublets, proofs enough in all conscience to sustain Gassendi in his thesis that the *Kēpai dóξai*, like the *Enchiridion* of Epictetus, was a selection from the various works of the philosopher.

To these four important documents Usener has added not only all the fragments of Epicurus that have come down to us from antiquity, but also the various references to his doctrines. Needless to say the fragments of Philodemus have had a special fascination for the editor of the *Epicurea*, who says with the openness of a great scholar, 'fateor hic illic me cum litteras sensu cassas adponere taederet, ultra probabilitatem lusisse potius quam restituissse,' and actually indulges in a laugh at an exploded conjecture of his own.

In fine, the work is the fruit of many years of labor, and that the labor of a great master. It is the bulkiest book that bears the honored name of the editor, and the meagre outline given here fails utterly to do justice to the importance of the work in matter and in method.

B. L. G.

Schriftsprache und Dialekte im Deutschen nach Zeugnissen alter und neuer Zeit. Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache von ADOLF SOCIN. Heilbronn, Gebr. Henninger, 1888.

The relation of the various German dialects to a generally recognized *Schriftsprache*, their struggle for supremacy as affected by political, religious and other circumstances, presents one of the most interesting and difficult problems of philological criticism. Twice in the earlier history of the German language an approximate unity seems to have been attained, and the final supremacy of the present New High German as the dominant literary speech cannot be dated earlier than the German classics of the eighteenth century. A book which undertakes to give the history of this gradual development can be written from two points of view. The author may give us his own results, based upon extensive investigation of the subject, with due recognition of the work of those scholars who have labored in the same line. But he may also refrain from making original investigations, simply presenting what others have thought and discovered concerning the problems in question. The present volume belongs to the latter class. It is agreeable to notice that its young author does not impose upon us immature views of his own, which in the face of the vast material would at best be the repetition of others. We find in a careful and diligent manner here recorded the results of the work of leading investigators in the field, and beginners in the study of German philology will doubtless read Socin's book with much benefit. The author's shyness in the expression of original opinions should not, however, have been carried so far as to cause him to refrain from pointing out new fields of inquiry, from propounding new problems and opening up suggestive perspectives. The book is written in a singularly circuitous style, which makes it a task to struggle through the 536 pages.

J. G.